



RECEIVED  
2003 OCT 10 AM 10:37  
T.R.A. DOCKET ROOM

October 2, 2003

Ron Jones, Director  
Tennessee Regulatory Authority  
460 James Robertson Parkway  
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505

Re: Docket No. 03-00502  
Workshop to Gather Information from the Telecommunications Industry Related to  
Preventing Violations of Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-21-114

Dear Mr. Jones:

This is in response to your Notice of Filing dated September 16, 2003 in the above referenced Docket. Although U.S. TelePacific Corp. d/b/a TelePacific Communications is a certificated competitive carrier in the State of Tennessee, our Company has not as yet commenced operations. Therefore, we have not addressed the issue of operational compliance with Tenn. Code Ann. §65-21-115 (a).

If you have any additional questions please contact me at telephone number (213) 21303288 or via e-mail to [jdelahanty@telepacific.com](mailto:jdelahanty@telepacific.com).

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jane Z. Delahanty', is written over a horizontal line.

Jane Z. Delahanty  
Assistant Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

RECEIVED

2003 OCT 10 AM 10:37



October 6, 2003

By Facsimile and Regular USPS Mail

Ron Jones, Director  
Tennessee Regulatory Authority  
460 James Robertson Parkway  
Nashville, TN 37243-0505

RE: Docket No. 03-00502

Workshop to Gather Information from the Telecommunications Industry  
Related to Preventing Violations of Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-21-114.

Dear Director Jones,

In response to the Notice of Filing dated September 16, 2003 referencing the above docket and impending workshop, New Edge Network, Inc. offers the following responses to the inquiries:

Inquiry 1. Describe the manner in which you are able to provide telecommunications service in compliance with Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-21-114(a). If you do not currently take steps to ensure compliance with § 65-21-114(a), explain your reason for not doing so.

Response: New Edge Networks does not provide local exchange services in Tennessee.

Inquiry 2. Identify any technical, operational, administrative or other difficulties encountered when attempting to comply with Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-21-114(a).

Response: Not applicable since New Edge Networks is not providing local exchange services in Tennessee.

Inquiry 3. Provide a suggestion for how this workshop should proceed.

Response: Since New Edge Networks does not provide local exchange services in Tennessee, the company cannot offer any suggestions of value to the moderator.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Kathleen Beigh Shotsky'.

Kathleen Beigh Shotsky  
Manager – External Affairs

3000 Columbia House Blvd, Suite 106  
Vancouver, WA 98661-2969  
Phone: 360.693.9009  
Fax: 360.693.9997  
www.newedenetworks.com



RECEIVED

2003 OCT 10 AM 10:37

T.R.A. DOCKET ROOM

October 8, 2003

**VIA FACSIMILE & OVERNIGHT DELIVERY**

Mr. Ron Jones  
Tennessee Regulatory Authority  
460 James Robertson Parkway  
Nashville, TN 37243-0505

Re: Docket No. 03-00502; Workshop to Gather Information Related to Preventing Violations of  
Tenn. Code Ann. §65-21-114

Dear Mr. Jones:

On behalf of Primus Telecommunications, Inc. ("Primus"), please accept the following responses to the TRA's inquiries in the above-referenced docket:

Q: *Describe the manner in which you are able to provide telecommunications service in compliance with Tenn. Code Ann. §65-21-114(a). If you do not currently take steps to ensure compliance with §65-21-114, explain your reason for not doing so.*

Primus is a non-facilities based reseller of intrastate long distance services in Tennessee and purchases services from various long distance carriers on a wholesale basis. As part of its wholesale arrangement with its underlying carriers, Primus receives Call Detail Records ("CDRs") and in turn, bills customers based on those CDRs. If those carriers filter out the intra-county calls, then Primus does not charge its customers for those calls. However, if the underlying carrier does not or cannot identify those intra-county calls to Primus, Primus does not have any mechanism to internally flag or suppress billing for those calls.

It was only until very recently that Primus became aware that our underlying carriers were including the intra-county calls with the other long distance calls in the CDRs. Upon learning that this was an issue, Primus's Director of Vendor Management contacted both the RBOC and our underlying long distance carriers to find out why these calls were included in our long distance bills and not being designated as toll free. We discovered that some of the carriers were able to identify the intra-county calls and suppress billing for their own customers, but they did not do the same for their wholesale accounts. When asked to provide this service to us, these vendors refused. Other carriers admitted that all intra-county calls were billed to us as toll calls and they were not able to flag or otherwise suppress the billing.

Further research indicates that the RBOC may have provided one carrier with a matrix of NPA/NXX numbers that will help identify which calls are intra-county. Primus wanted to get a copy of that matrix to see if it would be possible to integrate that information into our own billing system, but notwithstanding requests to both the RBOC and the carrier for copies of that matrix, both were uncooperative.

As a switchless reseller without a very basic billing system and no Feature Group D network of its own, Primus is, in many ways, subject to the billing practices of our underlying carriers. Nonetheless, our vendor management and billing departments continue to try and find a solution that will allow us to flag these calls so that customers are not charged for toll free calls. In the interim, we continue to fully credit customers when they call in to our customer service department complaining that an intra-county call should be toll free. We recognize this is an imperfect solution, but until our underlying carriers are in compliance, or we can devise a way to alter our own billing system based on the CDRs we are given, we can only address the situation with the customers directly.

**Q: *Identify any technical, operational, administrative or other difficulties encountered when attempting to comply with Tenn. Code Ann. §65-21-114(a).***

As described above, Primus is a switchless reseller of services that receives CDRs from its underlying carriers. Notwithstanding significant effort on the part of our vendor management, billing and customer service teams, we have been unable to find any other carrier willing or able to assist us in our attempts to comply with Tenn. Code Ann. §65-21-114.

**Q: *Provide a suggestion for how this workshop should proceed.***

Primus only requests that any discussion regarding how carriers bill their own customers be applied to carriers that sell wholesale services to other carriers as well.

Primus extends its sincerest apologies for the tardiness of this filing. Unfortunately, this filing was held up in our mailroom and just delivered to me this morning. Please be assured that we will endeavor to timely file future responses with the TRA.

If you have any questions or if I can provide you any further information, please do not hesitate to call me at (703) 394-4503.

Best regards,



Kathleen Kerr Lawrence  
Assistant General Counsel